

United States Patent and Trademark Office



| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 09/844,257 | 04/27/2001 | Karin Kellner | CIBT-P01-099 8923 | |
| 28120 | 7590 09/20/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| ROPES & GRAY LLP | | | BRANNOCK, MICHAEL T | |
| ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110-2624 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | . 1646 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 09/844,257 | KELLNER ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Michael Brannock | 1646 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 29 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See attachment</u> . | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): see attachment. | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attachment. | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| 7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10.⊠ Other: <u><i>PT0-892</i></u> | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/844,257

Art Unit: 1646

Attachment to Advisory Action

Applicant is notified that the amendment will not be entered because it raises new issues with regard to 35 USC 103. Specifically, it appears that claims 1-3 and 8 would be rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Ingham et al, U.S. Patent No: 584409, as set forth previously, in view of either Pepinsky et al. U.S. Patent No: 6444793 or Seytter-T et al., Abstract Number A151, page S536, JBMR, November 1998, each of whom teach that the use of palmitoylated hedgehog protein is desirable.

Had the amendment been entered, claims 1-2 and 8 would remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No: 5844079 to Ingham et al. because it is an inherent feature of the expression of hedgehog protein in eukaryotic cells (as taught by Ingham, see col 42 for example), that the protein is modified with one palmitoyl moiety, as was well appreciated at the time the instant application was filed, see Seytter-T et al., Abstract Number A151, page S536, JBMR, November 1998. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but not deemed persuasive, for the reason set forth above, because the examiner maintains that Ingham adequately suggest the particular concentrations of the hedgehog protein, such that one of ordinary skill in the art would arrive at the claimed concentrations as a matter of simple routine optimization of operating parameters for the reasons set forth previously. Applicant does not appear to provide specific reasons as to why this might not be so.

Application/Control Number: 09/844,257

Art Unit: 1646

Applicant's proposed amendments and persuasive arguments would have obviated the remaining grounds of rejections had the amendments been entered.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brannock, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, Ph.D., can be reached at (571) 272-0961.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 872-9306. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

MB

ELIZABETH KEMMERER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Elyabet C. Kemmeres

September 8, 2004